



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

principle of progress. At home we set our faces anew against irrational power and prescriptive authority, against any system whereby the wills of the many are subjected to the uses of the few, and address ourselves again to the business of furthering the "depth and width of human intercourse" among us. And abroad we commit ourselves to the principle of enlightened internationalism, and renounce that old false competitive nationalism which is not an instrument but an obstacle to the main current of progress—to the "fruitful processes of co-operation in the great experiment of living together."

### INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

... **President Wilson's membership in the Allied Supreme War Council** is a "secret" shared recently by Secretary of War Baker with the American people when he was interviewed on his return from France. This is in addition to the representation which it has been generally known that the President enjoyed upon the Board of Military Advisers to the Council in the person of the American military adviser at Versailles, Gen. Tasker H. Bliss. As a member of the Supreme Council, of which the other members are the Premiers of France, Italy, and Great Britain, the President himself has a vote in all its decisions, and casts this vote by cable from Washington.

... **A characteristic German trick** may have been the addressing of the German note of October 6 to President Wilson, admitted Mr. Asquith, speaking at a luncheon in London on October 18. It may have been that the desire was, through addressing the youngest rather than the veteran co-belligerents, to inspire jealousy and sow dissension. If so, said Mr. Asquith, this was but another case of "Germany's chronic clumsiness," for none was more qualified, surely, than President Wilson to act as spokesman of the common cause, and the President's two replies thus far to the first note were both in spirit and substance exactly what the situation required. "We had set in England," said the *London Times* at the same juncture, "a very exacting standard for President Wilson's reply to the German request for an armistice and peace, but he has satisfied it." In France, the Foreign Minister, speaking with a decided note of exultation in the Senate, said on the same day that the President's attitude, in which the French Government had always had strong confidence, was identical with that of France.

... **Canadian comment** has followed events closely and with hearty approbation of the course of the United States, but it has been the part of one Ottawa newspaper to point out with unanswerable definiteness the chief flaw in the German proposals. "The trouble is," it says, "that Germany now asks the world to believe that she can keep fourteen articles of faith after demonstrating for four years that she cannot keep one."

... **Reparation in France** is the subject of a resolution introduced in the French Senate, and warmly in-

dorsed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, M. Pichon. In M. Pichon's opinion Germany ought to be made clearly to understand that she would be held responsible for reparation in full for all the crimes against international law that she had committed or might commit in the future. The French people, he claimed, are united on the claim that German destructions in France must be made good, and levies be imposed, town for town, in Germany, in order that the people themselves might understand the true meaning of such reparation. Yet this reparation, it is generally insisted by M. Pichon and the other responsible leaders in France, must be through indemnities and not destructions.

... **The return of Germany's colonies**, it is interesting to note, was the subject of an eloquent address delivered even so recently as September 30 by Dr. Solf, then Colonial Secretary, now Foreign Minister of Germany. Speaking to an audience that included the King of Bavaria, just two weeks before he began signing asseverations of Germany's desire to accept the Allies' peace terms, he declared the return of these colonies to be a task of national importance second to none, although close to it stood the need of Germany for "the open door for trade."

... **When is the "end of the war"?** The answer is the subject of a "white paper" recently issued by the British Select Committee on Emergency Legislation, in which the committee has agreed with the decision of an earlier committee headed by Mr. Justice Atkins, that for the purposes of emergency legislation and its interpretation the end of the war should be considered to be that date on which the treaty of peace is finally binding on the respective belligerents—that is to say, the date when all the ratifications are exchanged or deposited.

... **British views of a League of Nations** are to some extent contradictory. In his pamphlet of May 11, 1918, printed in *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* for July, Viscount Grey was inclined to answer affirmatively his own query: "Are the nations of the world prepared now, or will they be ready after the war, to look steadily and clearly at this aspect of the League of Nations, at the limitations and obligations that it will impose, and to say, wholehearted and convinced as they have never been before, 'We will accept and undertake them?'" In August Lord Robert Cecil, in an interview in London, declared himself personally doubtful whether "you in the United States would accept a European view of the Mexican question, or whether we should be willing to alter the government of Ireland to suit a League of Nations." In so far as the decisions of the league could be unanimous they would of course be acceptable, but majority rule—implicit in any "acceptance of limitation"—Lord Robert deemed fanciful. Justiciable questions should be submitted to arbitration, but all larger issues must be "thrashed out in public." Then, "if the decision reached is unanimous, it ought to become operative. If it is not unanimous, then we must rely on public opinion to bring about a solution. Only there must be no war until public discussion has been held. That is the only real advance I believe to be now possible."

... **Peace by force** seems the backbone of Lord Bryce's peace views, which thus contrast clearly with Viscount Grey's "peace through enlightenment" and Lord Robert Cecil's "peace by unanimous consent." "Nothing but force will restrain those to whom might is right," declared Lord Bryce in September, in the course of a newspaper interview appearing in the *New York Times*. "Where is the force to be found that will suffice? It can be found only in a combination of a sufficient number of great States, States materially strong, who love peace and freedom and will work for both by using their united strength against any disturber of the peace." Arbitration must be the first means of settling disputes, or conciliation in the case of non-justiciable disputes, and therefore some international tribunal is needful. But Lord Bryce turns back to reiterate unmistakably that "force must be behind the league."

... **Labor's view**, as expressed by the British Labor representative in the War Cabinet, the Right Hon. George N. Barnes, M. P., in an address on the subject of a League of Nations, at Cambridge some two months ago, is briefly that nations must to some extent subordinate sovereignty to international necessities, and do it freely, or we can reconcile ourselves to the continuation of world wars. No middle ground seemed possible. Economic pressure he greatly favored as a persuader of recalcitrant or too effervescent nations, but "there must be a provision for the military weapon in the last resource." The league must include Germany—that is, there must be but one league—the League, not a League. Two leagues existed before the war, and have demonstrated satisfactorily that that system is impossible. Armaments of each must be limited by all; there must, therefore, be full and open knowledge ascertainable of all armament building. Mr. Barnes favored taking the initial steps at once, and the principal one would be the final thrashing out between the Allies of the disturbing factor of sovereignties. His own idea of a practical scheme of international organization included (1) an inter-allied Hague conference, at which peoples as well as governments should be represented; (2) a standing court of a purely international nature to interpret existing laws and covenants; (3) a court of conciliation to deal with questions outside the judicial court's scope; (4) a research commission to examine present proposals and experiments leading towards successful international settlements, and to determine how to avoid past failures; and (5) an inter-allied commission to consider territorial adjustments on the basis of national unities and to study the question of the administration of backward areas by trusteeship. Mr. Barnes considered the "final aim" of any league of nations to have been stated for all time in the words of President Wilson: "What we seek is the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind."

... **Swedish plans for international organization** were given expression at the Scandinavian Inter-Parliamentary Conference in Stockholm in September. These provide for (1) the establishment of a league

comprising all the nations of the world; (2) mutual engagements between the States to submit every dispute which cannot be diplomatically settled and is of a judicial nature to the arbitration either of the existing Hague Court or a specially designated body; (3) an international committee of investigation with power to treat all questions other than these, the while all countries concerned agree to wait peaceably on its decision, and (4) a permanent international council as the centralizing organ of the various international committees.

... **Swiss interest in a league of nations**, declared President Calonder not long ago, was of a fundamental character, due to the fact that Switzerland itself was but a federation of peoples of four different languages and cultures, yet bound fast with a strong sentiment of mutual interest and common nationality. In his speech before the Swiss National Council, in which he made clear the official Swiss attitude of high approbation of the League of Nations' idea, Dr. Calonder quoted the motto given Switzerland by her great writer Gottfried Keller as the heart and soul of all international unity: "Friendship in freedom." He referred to the political life of his country as a veritable preliminary to a League of Nations. In this respect, too, Switzerland has an international mission that is unmistakable: "To further peace and friendship among all peoples and to prove to the world by her example that different races and people of a different tongue could, on the basis of mutual esteem, on the basis of freedom and equality, be united into one happy community."

... **Danger threatening the League** lies in the possible repetition of the "Troppau protocol" idea, which doomed forever the usefulness of the Holy Alliance in 1820, according to the opinion of J. A. R. Marriott, M. P., writing of historical precedents in the *Hibbert Journal*. Resolving originally not to meddle in the internal affairs of any member of the Alliance, democratic uprisings against autocratic rule threatened this "League of Kings," resulting in the agreement at Troppau that "States which have undergone a change of government due to revolution, the results of which threaten other States, *ipso facto* cease to be members of the European alliance. . . . If, owing to such alterations, immediate danger threatens other States, the powers bind themselves by peaceful means, or if need be by arms, to bring back the guilty State into the bosom of the Great Alliance." The writer considers that a monarchical *coup d'état* carried out in a member nation of the League of Democracies would immediately precipitate a similar situation. "Is there not," he asks, "a serious danger that the League of Peace will founder upon the self-same rock which proved fatal to the high hopes and laudable endeavors of the Holy Allies?"

... **A German League of Nations**, not necessarily the same thing as the German world originally planned, is, according to Amsterdam gossip a matter of serious discussion in the German Foreign Office, in which the collaboration of prominent deputies and jurists has been permitted. Proposals, it is said, have already been drafted which in the main harmonize with the Majority

Party's general program. A special commission has been proposed to study these proposals and frame a complete draft of the German version of a League of Nations.

... **Austrian confederation and Hungarian independence**, as proclaimed in Austria-Hungary by Imperial manifesto, do not strike a responsive chord among the peoples concerned. The granting of independence to Hungary comes only as a belated sequel to the reading of a declaration of independence in the Hungarian Parliament, and to public statements by such men as Dr. Wekerle and Count Karolyi denouncing Austria's foreign policy as, if anything, worse since the war than before, and utterly foreign to the aspirations and convictions of the Hungarian people. The Czechoslovaks, who by the provisions of Emperor Karl's manifesto would form a so-called autonomous State within the Austrian Confederation, revert to their statement of September 29, issued in Prague, in which it was declared that "the Austrian Government is unable to give us anything that we ask for." and the unwavering determination was expressed for absolute independence. Dr. Trumbic, President of the Yugoslav Committee in London, characterizes the confederation manifesto as belonging "to a series of prepared manœuvres." "The Hapsburgs," he declared in the course of a recent interview, "promised those nationalities freedom and equal rights whenever circumstances compelled them to try to save their dynasty. . . . The Hapsburgs forgot all these the moment they felt themselves secure, and hence, instead of freedom and equal rights, we see them in Austria-Hungary today ruling five nationalities comprising thirty million people who are deprived of all political and national rights, and who are abandoned to the economic exploitation of the Germans and Magyars." This leader of the Yugoslavs is convinced that the same state of affairs would come about again, despite all promises of autonomy if Austria-Hungary is allowed to exist. As it is, the proposed Yugoslav State within the federation is not Jugoslavia at all, as that nation has been organized according to locus and nationality; it is, on the contrary, an arbitrary truncation of Jugoslavia, including Croatia, Bosina, Herzegovina and Dalmatia under the Two-Headed Eagle, and leaving out Serbia, Albania, Montenegro, and lesser districts. On October 19 the London Yugoslav Committee definitely rejected the manifesto. Meanwhile the Italian deputies in Vienna, representing Italian populated districts within Austria, have sided unreservedly with the Yugoslavs and Czechoslovaks for complete separation from Austrian control.

... **A Democratic Mid-European Union** has been formed on paper by representatives of the Czechoslovaks, Poles, Ukrainians, Yugoslavs, Lithuanians, Finns, Rumanians and Italians, meeting in Washington, D. C., October 3. Under the chairmanship of Prof. Thomas G. Masaryk, President and representative in this country of the Czechoslovak National Council, and informal representative here as well of the Poles and Yugoslavs of Austria-Hungary, and under the directorship of Prof. Herbert Adolphus Miller, plans were worked out

for the beginning of a campaign of educational propaganda in this country and in the nationalities concerned, much on the general lines of the Pan-American Union. The first purpose of the Union is the reconciliation of the differences that have formerly kept these nationalities apart, although their great common anti-German interest demanded the closest unity and co-operation. The second purpose is to prepare for the coming of peace, in such manner that the nations may no more be kept apart as in the past, and their common purposes diffused, by skillful playing on ignorance to arouse petty jealousy and misunderstanding. It is estimated that the gathering in Washington represented ten million nationals in the United States and sixty-five millions in Europe. The meeting in Washington was the direct consequent of a great mass meeting in New York City in September, which was followed by the reception of a delegation by President Wilson at the White House, September 20, on which occasion a specific demand was made for the dissolution of the Austria-Hungarian Empire.

... **Greece and Serbia** have also been working for a unity of purpose which shall be effectual at the peace-table, and in this work, undertaken in London by Mr. Pasic, Serbian Premier, and Mr. Venizelos, the Greek Premier, Rumania is joining, through the representation of Mr. Take Jonescu. It is declared that all Serbo-Rumanian questions have been satisfactorily settled, including the long vexatious matter of boundaries in the Banat of Hungary. In contradiction of Serbia's reputed intention to control affairs in the proposed Jugoslavia, Mr. Pasic has definitely affirmed that absolute self-determination is the actual plan, whereby the Serbs, Slovenes and Croats will not only be free of Austrian influence, but will be free also to declare whether the Serbo-Croat-Slovene union is truly their desire.

... **The "oppressed nationalities" are now co-belligerents**, Dr. Trumbic, President of the Yugoslav Committee in London, has recently pointed out. Their conference in Paris is distinguished from the one in Rome last spring by the very fact that they no longer meet as petitioners of the Allied Nations, but as their allies. Representatives of the Allies, indeed, meet with them as partakers in their discussions. Dr. Trumbic's ideal, like that of those who are working in the United States is, as he terms it, a "League of Free Nations of Central Europe." He considers it a most significant fact, auspicious of the final emergence of an intact Jugoslavia, that the women and children of Yugoslav lands form the very backbone of the movement for freedom. Thus the movement reaches into the homes and family life, giving it a strength bound eventually to be irresistible. The final condition he visualizes as one in which Upper and Lower Austria figure as a new republican commonwealth on lines of the Swiss Confederation, and join together with the compact Magyar national State, in political, economic and social intercourse with surrounding Central European peoples, joining as well in the relations which these, in their turn, will establish with the rest of Europe and the world.

... **Italian recognition of the Yugoslavs** has gone as far as an official statement, the first supporting their claims. This states that "the Council resolves to inform the Allies' governments that the Italian Government regards the movement of the Yugoslav peoples for the conquest of their independence, and for their constitution into a free State, as corresponding to the principles for which the Entente is fighting and also to the aims of a just and lasting peace." The source or sustenance of the opposition to Yugoslav recognition, which many Italian writers have claimed has been keeping the whole Italian people out of step with the enlightened thought of the rest of the Allies, seems to have been in Foreign Minister Sonnino, who has been severely criticized by such Roman journals as the *Secolo* and the *Carriere della Serra* for having refused to receive Dr. Trumbic. *Epoca*, supposed to reflect the views generally of Premier Orlando, a firm and constant champion of Yugoslav recognition, has urged that territorial discussions—the main bone of contention and source of procrastination in this respect—must necessarily be put over to the end of the war, with the idea that so long as such matters interfere with a frank and friendly attitude towards the oppressed nationalities, Austria is given a weapon of deadly effectiveness against Italy's military efforts.

... **Czechoslovak and Yugoslav unity**, which has been warmly confirmed by such Czechoslovak leaders as Dr. Edward Benes, writing in the Italian *Unità* and by a Yugoslav leader recently in the Paris paper *La Nation Tchèque*, appears gradually to be making its impression on Italian thought, which has been tempted to contrast these two Slavic peoples, to the advantage of the Czechoslovaks and the disparagement of the Yugoslavs. A well-balanced writer, thought to be Gaetano Salvemini, in an article in *Unità* has pointed out that the Yugoslavs have known since 1915 that certain treaties existed between the Entente powers definitely obstructing their national unity, in which, indeed, their territory had been parceled out with little concern to their wishes in the matter, and it is not to be wondered that they have been unable in the face of this to maintain to the full extent the same cordial relations with Italy that the Czechoslovaks, uninvolved in similar Entente schemes, have kept up. Meanwhile over eighty thousand Yugoslavs are fighting against Austria, as volunteers in the various armies, and numerous Yugoslav prisoners in Italy have begged the privilege of fighting on the side of the Allies. This would seem to earn their right to be considered quite as seriously as their fellow Slavs, were it not true also, as Dr. Benes has asserted, that "if the smallest section of the Yugoslavs remained part of Austria-Hungary, this would necessarily lead the Entente to accept the continued existence of the Dual Monarchy" and thereby doom the hopes of Bohemia as a free State. Added to this, the Italian Socialist Union, a new organization but containing many adherents from different sections, has declared that a prime prerequisite for any society of free nations is the complete dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire into homogeneous and independent national States. In an order of the day recently passed, the

Union states definitely that it would be impossible to desire an independent Bohemia or Poland and at the same time to combat the Yugoslav national movement.

... **Serbian war aims**, as stated in London this summer by the Serbian Minister, include four chief aims which to all appearances harmonize perfectly with the larger aims of the Allied Nations. The first of them, as might be expected, is the union of the Serbs, Montenegrins, Croats and Slovenes in a Yugoslav State, and it is for the sake of this union, it was stated, that the Serbs and Montenegrins "have sacrificed everything." The second aim is "the Balkans for the Balkan people," or freedom for its nationals to work out their destinies unharassed by hegemonies and interventions. Thirdly, Serbia is concerned with the restoration of the devastated areas inhabited by Southern Slavs, including Serbia, Montenegro and Albania, in which she "hopes that the Allies will see that justice is done . . . on similar lines as the help they intend for Belgium and Poland." The final aim is free commercial and intellectual intercourse with the rest of the world.

... **United States' recognition of Yugoslavia** has been urged upon our State Department by members of the London Committee, introduced to Secretary Lansing by Representative Frank James of Michigan early in September. The deputation was kindly received and requested to furnish all data supporting the request for recognition. It is noted that the principal objection in the past to the recognition of Yugoslav aims lay in the fact that the new State infringed formerly on the claims made by Italy for the restoration of the Italian Irredenta. The fact that all reports indicate these differences have now been reconciled is regarded as the most hopeful sign for Yugoslav recognition.

... **American aid to the Balkan peoples**, mainly through propaganda and financial assistance, is the aim of the Union League Club of Chicago, which has recently taken up the cause of the Yugoslavs, Czechoslovaks and other small nations of the East and Near East. The intention is to arouse the people of the Middle West to insist that the Government of the United States make no treaty of peace that does not fulfill the just aspirations of the smaller national groups, now or formerly held under the domination of the Central Powers. Among those deeply interested in this move are Prof. Samuel N. Harper and Dean Shailer Mathews of the University of Chicago; Dr. A. Biankini, president of the Yugoslav Council of North America, and Charles Pergler, secretary of the Czechoslovak National Council. It is stated that the club will include in its propaganda a move to have the Yugoslavs recognized as an independent people, following the precedent of the United States in recognizing the Czechoslovak State in this manner.

... **A Czechoslovak Declaration of Independence** was published in Paris, October 18, declaring definitely for a republican form of government and complete severance from Austria-Hungary. Its authors are Prof. Thomas G. Masaryk, Prime Minister and Minister of

Finance of the new government, Ben. Dr. Milan R. Stefanik, Minister of National Defense, and Dr. Edward Benes, Minister of Foreign Affairs and of the Interior. These, forming the Czechoslovak National Council, declare themselves "in complete accord with the declaration of the Czech deputies made in Prague on January 6, 1918." [See ADVOCATE OF PEACE for July, 1918, page 214.] The declaration is made on the basis of the fact that the quality of an independent State which Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia combined enjoyed in 1526 they have never surrendered voluntarily. Union with Austria-Hungary at that time was purely in the nature of a defensive alliance against the Turk, an understanding which Austria violated and overrode. The declaration proceeds to sum up the indictment in full against Austria-Hungary and to state forcefully the depth and sincerity of Czechoslovakia's allegiance to the principles of democracy. The main principles of the new nation's Constitution are then outlined as (1) a republican government, (2) freedom of conscience, religion, and science, literature and art, speech, the press and the right of assembly and petition, (3) complete separation of church and State, (4) universal suffrage, with political, social and cultural equality for women, (5) protection of minorities through proportional representation, (6) a parliamentary government, with the initiative and referendum, and (7) a militia in place of a standing army. Social and economic reforms are promised on a large scale, and its due share of the Austrian pre-war debt is fully assumed. It is interesting to note that a contemporary dispatch from Vienna states that the organization of the Czechoslovak State has been worked out to the smallest detail, even to complete regulations and instructions for the full operation of national railway, telegraph and currency systems.

... **Revolution in Bohemia**, according to creditable reports, sprang into being only a few days before the publication of the above-mentioned declaration. On October 15 a general strike was declared in Prague and there and elsewhere throughout Bohemia and Moravia at revolutionary meetings the oath of complete allegiance to Czechoslovak aims was taken. About the same time our State Department received word that eighty-six Polish deputies to the Reichsrat had met at Cracow and organized themselves as a body for the future to be definitely separated from the Reichsrat.

... **Recognition of Czechoslovak national rights** has been granted by this time by practically all of the Allies. That of the United States was issued by Secretary Lansing September 3. It reads:

The Czechoslovak peoples having taken up arms against the German and Austro-Hungarian Empires, and having placed organized armies in the field, which are waging war against those Empires under officers of their own nationality and in accordance with the rules and practices of civilized nations; and,

The Czechoslovaks having, in prosecution of their independent purposes in the present war, confided supreme political authority to the Czechoslovak National Council.

The Government of the United States recognizes that a state of belligerency exists between the Czechoslovaks thus organized and the German and Austro-Hungarian Empires.

It also recognizes the Czechoslovak National Council as a de facto belligerent Government, clothed with proper authority to direct the military and political affairs of the Czechoslovaks.

The Government of the United States further declares that it is prepared to enter formally into relations with the de facto Government thus recognized for the purpose of prosecuting the war against the common enemy, the Empires of Germany and Austria-Hungary.

The declaration of the British Government to the same effect, published August 13, declared that—

The Czechoslovaks have constituted a considerable army, fighting on three different battlefields, and attempting in Russia and Siberia to arrest the Germanic invasion. In consideration of its efforts to achieve independence, Great Britain regards the Czechoslovaks as an allied nation and recognizes the unity of the three Czechoslovak armies as an allied and belligerent army waging regular warfare against Austria-Hungary and Germany.

Great Britain also recognizes the right of the Czechoslovak National Council as the supreme organ of Czechoslovak national interests and as the present trustee of the future Czechoslovak Government to exercise supreme authority over this allied and belligerent army.

More concrete support, possibly, is given in the Italian treaty of June 30, 1918, and by France in a similar treaty at the same time. The Italian treaty provides that Czechoslovak laws go into effect within the Italian Kingdom upon the day of their publication in the *Gazzetta Ufficiale del Consiglio Nazionale Tzechoslovaco*; that Czechoslovak military courts shall have jurisdiction over all nationals who have sworn the oath of fidelity as members of the Czechoslovak Army or who as civilians swear the official oath of citizenship; that whatever immediate exercise of rights of sovereignty is necessary shall be exercised by the representatives of the Czechoslovak National Council who are accredited to the Italian Government; that crimes committed by Italians against Czechoslovaks, their nation or army, shall be punished as if they were committed against the safety of the State or Army of Italy. This treaty is regarded as a precedent in international law because of this last clause, which grants rights that even American officials or American residents in Italy do not have, and also because it gives official recognition to a government which does not control an inch of its homeland. Japanese recognition was announced in September by Prof. Masaryk. This declared the Japanese Government as "happy to regard the Czechoslovak Army as an allied and belligerent army, . . . and to recognize the right of the Czechoslovak National Council to exercise the supreme control over that army. They are further prepared to enter into communication with the duly authorized representatives of the Czechoslovak National Council whenever necessary on all matters of mutual interest in the Japanese and Czechoslovak forces in Siberia."

... **Spanish foreign policy** is not a matter of general criticism in this country. As one writer implies, the United States takes it for granted from the writings of certain pro-German correspondents sending material here that Spain has let by-gones be by-gones and has conceived a genuine admiration for ourselves, and we are content to let our inquiry rest there. Certain opinions somewhat better informed than this have appeared



recently. One of these, a Spanish view, is that of Count de Romanones, at present Minister of Worship and Justice and formerly Premier of Spain. This appears as preface to a French work on "The Foreign Policy of Spain," by M. Albert Mousset. The writer deplores the fact that Spanish foreign policy has given precedence to everything else in political life and that its neglect constitutes for Spain a "gigantic blunder." Spain's course of graceful isolation from the affairs of the stronger powers has brought her to futility. When the war ends "there will not be air for those lonely ones to breathe . . . it will not be possible to live without having a clear and definite international policy." At the end of the war certain great blocks of powers will control the affairs of the world, and Spain will then find herself neither flesh, fowl nor good red herring. A sharp criticism, from this country, of such statements is presented by the editor of the *Christian Science Monitor*. This writer points out that the Count's only basis of criticism or argument is that Spain is likely not to "stand in" with the great powers after the war. "Spain should take note that circumstances have long since forced the world to recognize that the present war is a war for righteousness, for the faith of treaties, and the safety of civilization. If in this struggle she finds that she is 'not committed in any way,' she cannot complain if the world, the only world that matters, holds that she 'counts little in the course of events.'" Cuban opinion, furnished to the same paper by a writer of Cuban nationality, states the cause of Spain's "disgraceful situation" to be that "egoism has substituted patriotism" among its leaders. That is why Germany can still continue an evasive course despite over a hundred Spanish ships sent to the bottom by German submarines, and why 70,000 German soldiers from the Cameroons, supposedly interned, have been allowed to go free in peasant dress, learn the Spanish language to perfection, and then travel rapidly and unmolested through the Allied countries. Added to this, this writer continues, King Alfonso XIII is between a pro-Ally wife and a popular pro-German mother, while ranged against his own evident pro-Ally tendencies are the three great forces of the clergy, the army and the aristocracy.

. . . **Spain's seizure of German ships**, to the number of sixty-two, is by no means the startling event that it might have been did it not come as a lame sequel to a furious but harmless bombardment of Berlin by correspondence. Spain's correspondence school warfare began months ago with protests to Berlin over the wilful sinking of Spanish vessels by German submarines, the while Germany was receiving every courtesy ashore, and several matters had been winked at which should, one might think, have earned the unofficial if not the official gratitude of Germany. Every Spanish protest, according to dispatches, has been followed by a breathless period of waiting on the part of Spain and of crafty abysmal silence on Germany's part. Meanwhile considerable excitement was worked up in Spain by espionage cases in the Spanish courts that began to cover certain German officials with obloquy. As suspicion was fast forming into certainty the famous censorship bill was passed, by the terms of which no facts detrimental to

or involving in any way any foreign officials might be printed or discussed in public. Since then political developments in Spain have been fairly successfully blanketed. Reports have, however, shown a change since the German retirement from Chateau-Thierry, in the course of which many new things have been discovered by Spain about herself. Introspection in army circles has revealed the fact that the Army has really never been so pro-German as it has been claimed to be. Elsewhere the conviction has grown that Spain has all along known that, while neutrality must be preserved, its best interests were on the side of the Allies. The sinking of the *Casara* in August, followed almost immediately by news of a second sinking of a Spanish trader, brought the Cabinet almost to the verge of desperate measures, but not until October 15 did definite news come of its decision to appropriate in its ports German tonnage equal to that destroyed by submarines, or about twenty per cent of the total Spanish mercantile tonnage.

. . . **The International Socialist movement**, according to one well-informed opinion, if "exclusive of or antagonistic to American organized labor," cannot hope to prevail. In this light it is interesting to note the development of the "Quarante" party among the French Socialists, a party siding with American labor in its repudiation of any peace by negotiation and in its support of intervention in Russia. To this party the celebrated French Socialist leader, Albert Thomas, has adhered, and by it the opposition, known as the *Minoritaires*, although now in the majority, has been successfully defied. In vain the Socialist National Council of France expresses its deepest regret at such unfilial action on the part of the "Quarante." It does not dare to disown utterly or take any definite action against the new organization. Meanwhile French Socialists generally who had declared that American opinion was not represented by the Labor men in France in mid-summer, and that it would be found to support the *Minoritaires*, were given conclusive and evidently disturbing proof where that opinion lay, in the visit of the American Socialist Mission to France in August last. This Mission, which included A. M. Simons, Charles Edward Russell and John Spargo, left no space for doubt that American Socialism is for a conclusive peace based solely on a decisive victory of arms.

. . . **The Inter-Allied Labor and Socialist Conference** in London the week of September 16 was apparently largely influenced in its deliberations by the firm and uncompromising attitude of our leading representative, Mr. Samuel Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor, and by the men who accompanied him. The official statement of the American delegation, read by Mr. Gompers, embodied two specific demands relating to the compacting of peace. These are, (1) that workers should have "direct official representatives" in the official delegations from each of the belligerent nations sharing in the forming of a peace treaty, and (2) that a world labor congress be held at the same time and place as the peace conference. The statement declared as the essentially fundamental ideas

for any peace treaty: (1) A league of free peoples of the world; (2) international economic and political equality; (3) no indicative indemnities or reprisals, but only such as would right manifest wrongs; (4) recognitions of the rights of small nations; (5) no territorial changes or adjustment of power save in the furtherance of the welfare of the people affected and of world peace.

## BOOK REVIEWS

Books listed here may be obtained, postage prepaid, upon remittance to American Peace Society, 613 Colorado Bldg., Washington, D. C.

**A History of the Great War, Vol. III: The British Campaign in France and Flanders, 1916.** By *Sir Arthur Conan Doyle*. George H. Doran Co., New York. 332 p., with index and maps. 1918. \$2.00.

This, as stated in the review of Volume II of this History, which appeared in *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* for December, 1917, is the chronicle of the first of the years of attack and advance, following the year of stabilization and gaining of equilibrium. Practically the whole of this book is taken up with the Battle of the Somme, which lasted from July 1 to November 14. Our own troops in France are having the relatively pleasurable experience of feeling the German line waver and break before them. In contrast to their no less gallant but more fortunately timed efforts, it is interesting to read of the five months' work of the British here north of the Somme in 1916, where on a front of twelve miles meager gains were pushed to a maximum of five miles deep at the cost of constant and costly effort, frequently of the most heroic sort. Faced with a still triumphant Germany, the British here wrought out some of the greatest victories of the war—victories of morale and indomitable courage that Germany has never won back, even when these feeble few miles between Albert and Bapaume were again and again fought over in later years. It is a task indeed to chronicle these anxious months of minute but steady progress, with due credit to all the gallant regiments and true-hearted leaders, shaping all into a co-ordinate whole. How well Sir Arthur has acquitted himself those who have read the preceding two volumes will well imagine.

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE.

*The following list includes only those publications which are now available. For a complete list, including those out of print, application should be made to the American Peace Society. Any of the following can be obtained postpaid from the American Peace Society upon application, accompanied by remittance of the prices here listed.*

### Publications of the Secretary's Office.

- Year Book for 1911. xv + 195 pages.
- Year Book for 1912. xvi + 165 pages.
- Year Book for 1913-1914. xviii + 203 pages.
- Year Book for 1915. xvii + 181 pages.
- Year Book for 1916. [With portrait of Andrew Carnegie as frontispiece.] xvii + 204 pages.
- Year Book for 1917. [With portrait of Andrew Carnegie as frontispiece.] xvii + 213 pages.
- Year Book for 1918. [With portraits of Albert K. Smiley, John L. Cadwalader, Joseph H. Choate, and John W. Foster.]
- Manual of the Public Benefactions of Andrew Carnegie [in preparation.]

### Publications of the Division of Intercourse and Education.

- No. 1. **Some Roads Towards Peace:** A report on observations made in China and Japan in 1912. By *Dr. Charles W. Elliot*. vi + 88 p. 1914.

- No. 3. **Educational Exchange with Japan.** By *Dr. Hamilton W. Mabie*. 8 p. 1914.
- No. 6. **Growth of Internationalism in Japan.** By *T. Miyoka*. iii + 15 p. 1915.
- No. 8. **For Better Relations with Our Latin American Neighbors.** In the original Spanish, Portuguese, and French. By *Robert Bacon*. viii + 221 p. 1915. A second edition of Mr. Bacon's Report, containing Nos. 7 and 8 in one volume, has also been published.
- No. 9. **Former Senator Burton's Trip to South America.** By *Otto Schoenrich*. iii + 40 p. 1915.
- No. 10. **Problems About War for Classes in Arithmetic.** By *David Eugene Smith, Ph. D., LL. D.* 23 p. 1915.
- No. 11. **Hygiene and War; Suggestions for Makers of Text-books and for Use in Schools.** By *George Ellis Jones, Ph. D.* 207 p. 1917.
- No. 12. **Russia, the Revolution and the War.** An account of a visit to Petrograd and Helsingfors in March, 1917. By *Dr. Christian L. Lange*, Secretary General of the Interparliamentary Union. 26 p. 1917.
- No. 13. **Greetings to the New Russia.** Addresses at a meeting held at the Hudson Theater, New York, April 23, 1917, under the auspices of the National Institute of Arts and Letters. 14 p. 1917.
- No. 14. **South American Opinions on the War: I. Chile and the War,** by *Carlos Silva Vildósola*; **II. The Attitude of Ecuador,** by *Nicolás F. López*. Translated from the Spanish by *Peter H. Goldsmith*. 27 p. 1917.
- No. 15. **The Imperial Japanese Mission, 1917.** A record of the reception throughout the United States of the Special Mission headed by Viscount Ishii, together with the text of the Lansing-Ishii agreement of 1917 on the status of Japan and the United States in China, and the text of the Root-Takahira understanding of 1908. Foreword by *Elihu Root*. 128 p. 1918.

### Publications of the Division of Economics and History.

- Nationalism and War in the Near East.** By a *Diplomatist*. Edited by Lord Courtney of Penwith. Published by the Clarendon Press, Oxford, England. xxvi + 434 p. 1915. Price, in Great Britain, 12s. 6d.; in U. S., \$4.15.
- The Industrial Development and Commercial Policies of the Three Scandinavian Countries.** By *Povl Drachmann*. Edited by Harald Westergaard, LL. D. Published by the Clarendon Press, Oxford, England. 130 p. 1915. Price, in Great Britain, 4s. 6d.; in U. S., \$1.50.
- Losses of Life in Modern Wars: Austria-Hungary; France.** By *Gaston Bodart, LL. D.* **Military Selection and Race Deterioration.** By *Vernon Lyman Kellogg*. Edited by Harald Westergaard, LL. D. Published by the Clarendon Press, Oxford, England. x + 207 + 6 p. 1916. Price, in Great Britain, 6s.; in U. S., \$2.00.
- Economic Protectionism.** By *Josef Grunzel*. Edited by Eugen von Philippovich. Published by the Clarendon Press, Oxford, England. xiii + 357 + 6 p. 1916. Price, in Great Britain, 8s. 6d.; in U. S., \$2.90.
- Epidemics Resulting from Wars.** By *Dr. Friedrich Prinzing*. Edited by Harald Westergaard, LL. D. Published by the Clarendon Press, Oxford, England. xii + 340 + 6 p. 1916. Price, in Great Britain, 7s. 6d.; in U. S., \$2.50.
- The Colonial Tariff Policy of France.** By *Dr. Arthur Girault*. Edited by Charles Gide. Published by the Clarendon Press, Oxford, England. x + 305 + 6 p. 1916. Price, in Great Britain, 7s. 6d.; in U. S., \$2.50.
- The Five Republics of Central America, Their Political and Economic Development and Their Relations with the United States.** By *Dana G. Munro*. Edited by David Kinley. Published by the Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York, N. Y. xvi + 332 p. 1918. Price, \$3.50.
- Federal Military Pensions in the United States.** By *William H. Glasson*. Edited by David Kinley. In press; price to be announced.